

# TOWN MEETING



June 3, 1956  
Vol. 22, No. 5  
925th Broadcast

## "WHAT ARE THE REAL CAMPAIGN ISSUES?"

### *Speakers:*

SEN. NORRIS COTTON

REP. WAYNE L. HAYS

### *Moderator:*

DR. SHEPHERD L. WITMAN



Broadcast from  
Lebanon, New Hampshire  
under auspices  
Chamber of Commerce

**BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR**

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time



## "WHAT ARE THE REAL CAMPAIGN ISSUES?"

ANNOUNCER: Tonight's TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR originates from the Opera House at Lebanon, New Hampshire. Here from this same platform, once a year, is held the Annual Town Meeting of New Hampshire's largest town. With a population of approximately 10,000 people, Lebanon operates under the town meeting form of government, with a three man board of selectmen serving as overseers of town affairs.

Lebanon, like many other New England towns, thrives on its town politics and every year the months preceding the annual town meeting are full of considerable controversy which is quickly forgotten after the meeting when the citizens get together and work again for a common purpose.

Located in what is known as the Tri-Town Area, consisting of Lebanon and Hanover in New Hampshire, and White River Junction in Vermont, Lebanon is the shopping and industrial center. Such famous products as Carter's Overalls and "Profile" Ski Clothing are manufactured in this town and distributed nationwide. Schoolboy Ski Teams from Lebanon have gained national prominence for their winning ways. Lebanon is the home of two of the distinguished guests who are with us tonight.

Now to preside as moderator of our discussion, here is Shepherd L. Witman, Director of Residential Seminars on World Affairs. Dr. Witman!

DR. WITMAN: Good evening, friends. Before we begin our discussion more vigorously tonight, it is indeed a great pleasure to introduce to the nationwide TOWN MEETING audience The Hon. Lane Dwinell, Governor of the State of New Hampshire.

GOV. DWINELL: As Governor of New Hampshire, I am happy to welcome AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR to our state and to New England where the town meeting form of local government began. I am especially pleased to welcome you to my own home town of Lebanon, in the lovely Dartmouth-Lake Sunapee Region of the Granite State -- to the very hall where, each year, we hold our own real town meeting. We are glad to share with you the atmosphere of that truly democratic institution which we so deeply cherish.

Let me extend warm greetings to former New Hampshire residents who may be listening, and to everyone, everywhere, let me offer an invitation to come and enjoy our mountains and our forests, our lakes and seashore, the quiet and charm of our countryside.

New Hampshire extends a hospitable, friendly and happy vacation wish to all of the other forty-eight states, and may we again remind you that many pleasures and a most cordial welcome always await you in New Hampshire.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you very much, Governor Dwinell, for that very gracious and warm welcome, which we appreciate very much indeed. I am sure that many others will share this marvelous countryside in the coming months.

Now the time has come when we have to pitch in to this problem which is ours for this evening and again in our country the time also has come when, in the words of the late Henry L. Mencken, "The hair and years will fly." It happens every four years, just before we the people go to the polls to register our demands in the national election. On what issues will we vote this time? There was a day when great, moving questions were debated long and vigorously in this country. Such matters as states rights versus federal concentration of powers, hard money against soft money, governmental security against rugged individualism, intervention against isolation. Are these days gone? Are there still great issues which we have not yet resolved in our nation, and on which our statesmen can give us differing leadership. Or, perhaps, have we, as a people, made up our collective mind on all of the great differences which we once thought important, and now must face our political future with nothing more to wrestle with than how we can do these things best, or who can do them better for us? Have men replaced issues, or is it still men and issues in this country? Well, these are some of the things that churn through my mind and we have two gentlemen here who will help us answer the questions for us.

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.

We are going to hear first from New Hampshire's own Senator Norris Cotton, Republican from this State, who was elected to the 80th Congress in 1946, and he has been a member of Congress ever since. In 1954, he was elected to the United States Senate to complete the term of the late Senator Charles W. Tobey. Senator Cotton is a member of the Committee on Public Works and Government Operations. We are delighted to have you here, although it is not quite appropriate for us to welcome you, Senator, in your home town and home state. It is a great pleasure to have you on TOWN MEETING, Senator Norris Cotton!

SEN. COTTON: Mr. Moderator, it is a pleasure to be here with my old neighbors and friends and I would like about three seconds to welcome to my home town of Lebanon, my esteemed personal friend, Congressman Wayne Hays, with whom I served in the House of Representatives and for whom I have a very sincere affection at all times except during this program.

The real campaign issue is the leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower. It blocks all other issues. This is always true when a President is a candidate for reelection. There are four simple, direct questions which the vote must answer in deciding the issue. First, what has President Eisenhower accomplished? Second, does he possess the confidence of our own people and the respect of other nations? Third, has he administered his great office with dignity and integrity? And last, but not least, could his opponent, whoever he may be, match his inspired leadership or command such confidence and respect? These are the issues in a nutshell. These are the questions, but plainly and bluntly. We must stick to them and insist on the answers. We must not be led astray with extraneous matters and trivialities.

What has President Eisenhower accomplished? First, and above all, peace. The war in Korea has been ended and the slaughter of American boys has been stopped. Under Eisenhower's leadership, the hope of peace in the world has been growing steadily brighter as each month and year has passed. Red China has been stopped at the Formosa Straits and again in Indo-China. Austria has been liberated -- the first time the Communists have ever surrendered a foot of territory once in their hands. West Germany has joined the free nations of the West. American diplomacy is off the defensive and has taken the offensive for peace.

Second, preparedness. Unlike the days of the last administration when we alternated between a heedless disbanding and a feverish rearming, we are following a constant defense policy which can be maintained through long years without impoverishing our people. We are manning the bastions of freedom with a powerful striking Air Force whose bases encircle the globe; a nuclear propelled Navy; Army divisions with 80% more fire power than World War II; an unflagging research in atomic weapons and guided missiles.

Third, prosperity. The same people who predicted a Republican depression are now sneering at Republican prosperity. The only way to win our race with the Communist dictators, without war, must be by demonstrating to the world that our free economy works. Under Eisenhower it does work. From the hour that he took office the dollar bill in your pocket, which had dropped to half its value, has held the same purchasing power. Moreover, it no longer has a drop of blood on it for it is based on peace production. Wages are the highest in history and they are being paid in real money, not phony dollars. More people are employed than ever before. The working man is getting a bigger share of the national income than ever before. Corporate profits for three years under Eisenhower were \$1 billion less than under the previous administration, yet personal incomes are \$123 billion more.

Fourth, progress. The Eisenhower Administration is responsive to human needs. Under it, 10 million more Americans are covered by Social Security benefits and those benefits are increased. 4 million more Americans are eligible for unemployment compensation. We can afford these benefits because we have reduced cost of government by \$10 billion a year. Taxes have been reduced by \$7.5 billion; two-thirds of this cut goes to individuals, the rest to business and industry to make jobs. The average American family of four has been saved about \$200 per year by the tax cut of 1954.

Under Eisenhower's leadership we are on the move for better health programs, water development, flood protection and for national highway programs which will keep the lifeblood of commerce coursing through the arteries of the nation.

These are some of the accomplishments. These are facts -- not fantasies. Does he possess the confidence of our own people and respect of other nations? The name of Eisenhower, General of the Armies, Supreme Commander of NATO and President of the United States is as well known on the streets of Baghdad as it is in Lebanon, New Hampshire. The evidence of the regard of our people for an Executive who insists he is the President of all the people -- not just one party or one creed or one color -- is so evident that his worst political enemies dare not attack him.

Has he administered his great office with dignity and integrity? You know the answer to that without any suggestions from me.

And now we come to the last question. Who can match Eisenhower's inspired leadership or command such world-wide confidence and respect? I shall leave that one for my good friend, Congressman Hays, to answer.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you, Senator Cotton. And now we'll hear from Congressman Wayne Hays, Ohio Democrat, who has chaired the Congressional Delegation to last Summer's NATO Conference in Paris. He is now the American representative on the permanent fifteen country steering committee of NATO. A member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and on Administration, Mr. Hays is serving his fourth term in Congress. He is a former Mayor of Flushing, Ohio and was with the United States Army in World War II. Welcome back to TOWN MEETING, Representative Wayne L. Hays.

REP. HAYS: Thank you, Dr. Witman. There are two things I would like to say before I begin my prepared statement. One is that I was shocked and saddened by the news that I heard, that TOWN MEETING will soon be leaving the air, after what I believe is twenty fruitful and beneficial years to the American public. The other is that I am very happy to be in Senator Cotton's home town. I did come up here to debate with him, but I want you, his friends and neighbors, to know that I don't hold him personally responsible for all the shortcomings and vicissitudes of the Republican Party.

It seems to me that the real campaign issues of the Fall campaign will be, first, the broad general issue of the failure of the present Administration to live up to its campaign promises. This will, in turn, resolve itself into specific issues and, obviously, some issues will have more effect in some parts of the country than others. Three that I think will be of widespread interest are, first, the failure of the Administration to do anything very much about the farm situation. As a matter of fact, the action of three weeks ago by Mr. Benson in adopting rigid price supports at the same time that the President was vetoing the Bill containing them, shows the confusion in the ranks of the Administration and makes it apparent that the Administration itself is acting only because of the impending election. Perhaps it would be fair to say that Mr. Benson is in favor of rigid principles and flexible supports for three years, but in election year is for flexible principles and rigid supports. The second issue that I think many of the people in the country will be concerned with is the action of the Administration on taxes. The Administration did sponsor an income tax cut which, of course, went to the higher brackets and the big corporations. It is much the same as when you cut a pie, and all the people with \$5,000 or less income, totalling nearly 90% of the population, get about 5% of the pie. All of those with an income above that, or corporate income, get the other 95%. Some people might say this is a poor way to cut a pie, but as a lady in my district said, the corporations wrote the receipt so you would expect them to dole out the portions.

Third, almost complete failure in foreign policy. No one can successfully deny that the American position around the world has deteriorated tremendously in the past three years. Possibly part of this reason is the fact that there has been no new idea in the foreign policy, but merely an attempt to use the Marshall Plan, which was tailor-made for Europe, all around the world. Obviously, putting guns in the hands of hungry millions and cropping up tottering dictatorships is not the way to win friends and influence people.

Another issue, of course, will be the big business take-over in Washington and I think the collateral issue will be the great crusade which was, according to the crusaders, going to clean out the five-percenters in Washington having gone astray and allowed the five-percenters to be replaced with twenty-five percenters. Apparently percenters are not bad if the percentage is big enough. I cite two instances. One is the general services administrator, soliciting business for his firm, and his excuse was when he was checked up on that he was only doing it at lunch time; and another man of Cabinet rank soliciting business for his firm on the stationery of the Defense Department. When he was confronted with this fact he first tried to excuse it and instead of the head crusader firing him, he was allowed to resign and was given a medal and full military honors when he left town.

There are other issues which will come along as the campaign develops and which we may find here tonight, but which I will not have time to cover in this opening statement.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you very much, Congressman Wayne Hays. Now, Senator Cotton, do you want to come back at Representative Hays?

SEN. COTTON: I welcome that opportunity and I would like to take up the issues he brought up in their reverse order, because I think the reverse order is the order of their importance.

Now, in the first place, the word "deteriorated." From what and to what has our foreign policy deteriorated? Has it deteriorated from the days when a war was raging in South Korea, and later when we were being humiliated by week after week and month after month of phony negotiations -- something that was promptly ended as soon as the Administration came in? Has it deteriorated from the days when we were prostrate before Russia trying to fly supplies in a village? Has it deteriorated from the days when we were sold out at Yalta and at Potsdam? I suggest to you that even though all is not rosy, and I would insult your intelligence and anyone's else, to claim that it is, I would suggest to you that with Germany as our bulwark in the West and with a new alliance and agreement in the East and with Russia forced to change her tactics and as the President so well said, "Winners do not change policies," that our foreign policy is a point upon which I am most proud, even though I wouldn't for a moment predict what may happen in the future -- so far it has been a working foreign policy. I would also go on to mention, very briefly, that if two people can be referred to as having been dismissed or allowed to resign from the Eisenhower Administration because of improper conduct, I would remind you that their conduct was not criminal, it was nothing that could be prosecuted, it was a lack of respect for the high office and they were promptly dismissed. As against that, I would mention the fact that in the preceding administration, since then, on embezzlements we have had 26 indictments and 22 convictions; bribery, 32 indictments and 14 convictions; conspiracy, 69 indictments and 32 convictions; extortion, 8 indictments and 3 convictions -- all of them important holders of office. I suggest last that the farm question, under the Democratic Administration, under rigid price supports dropped 31 points, and they have dropped only 2 points in the two years we've had flexible price supports and the thing we have to come back is the uneconomic accumulation of surpluses.

DR. WITMAN: It's your turn, Congressman Hays, but before you come back, let's point out that we've got three issues here now, I think. We have foreign policy, honesty in government and the farm issue. I wonder if we can talk about each of them separately and explore each one a little more thoroughly that way.

REP. HAYS: I'm in favor of that and I'd like, first, to speak about foreign policy. The Senator says that the war is over in Korea and, of course, that is true. He failed to point out to you that the minute the peace treaty was signed in Korea, that the Chinese Communists took the troops which were released from there and sent them into Indo-China and took over Indo-China and defeated the French and drove them out. He talks about the long months of fruitless negotiations. Sure, this Administration ended the negotiations and it ended them on the terms of the Communists. It gave them exactly what they want. They violated even those truce agreements. And so, in those two specific instances, I would say our foreign policy is deteriorating. I

was out in the Near East last Fall. We don't know whether we're on the side of the Arabs or Israelis. As a matter of fact, what we are succeeding in doing out there is making both sides suspicious of us, so that we'll wind up with no friends at all. In the case of India, we rage -- our Administration seems to -- at India because she wants to be neutral. We forget that we're neutral in the argument between the Greeks and the English over Cyprus. We forget that we're neutral in the argument between Holland and Indonesia over West New Guinea. It's fine for America to be neutral, but if any other nation wants to be neutral we immediately start to criticize and condemn them. I think, personally, that it is more important to have those people neutral than it is to drive them into the hands of the enemy, the Communists. I think Secretary Dulles, as someone has so aptly said, sometimes it takes armies to save a nation from going Communist, but if Secretary Dulles had just not made his unfortunate remark about Goa we would have had a lot more friends in India than we do today, so sometimes it is just poor administration rather than, I'd say, maladministration rather than any desire to be bad that causes our foreign policy to deteriorate.

DR. WITMAN: Without taking a position on either side of this matter, I am impressed by the apparent evidence, Gentlemen, that our foreign policy is not a bipartisan foreign policy. Apparently there are partisan sides. Is foreign policy going to be an issue between the parties?

REP. HAYS: Perhaps I could say, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for three years I have gone down to the well of the House and defended the Administration's policy and tried to promote its mutual security program and to get its foreign policy legislation passed, and many times I have defended it from attacks from the isolationist wing of the Administration's own party. But if you will permit me to just use a personal little anecdote, I was somewhat in the position of the Italian in my district who had opposed me in the primary. He wanted to be on the executive committee and the chairman said, "Well, if you're going to be on the executive committee in the fall campaign, you'll have to get up at the next meeting of the Italian-American Club and say something good for Congressman Hays." And so he got up and spoke in Italian and the interpreter gave me this interpretation. He wound up by saying, "Well, as bad as he is, I'm for Hays because he's better than the other fellow." Well, I'm for the Administration's foreign policy, although I may find some faults with it, because it is better than no foreign policy and I have supported it on that basis.

SEN. COTTON: I would like to say that foreign policy is bipartisan and I thank God it always will be bipartisan, because in the matters having to do with peace and protecting us from being engaged in war, I am not a Republican and I am sure that my friend over across is not a Democrat. We are united with one imperative objective. But let me also suggest that when you start picking foreign policy to pieces, let's look at the results and when we criticize, let's ask our opponents to tell us what they would do. We had a high policy summit conference at Geneva. Let me suggest to you people that for the first time in years we took the offensive in diplomacy. If we had gone to Geneva and before we had the chance our opponents had suggested the outlawing of atomic weapons, we would have been in the situation of being obliged to say Yes, and let down our defenses, or say No, and stand before the world as the one nation opposed to outlawing that horrible weapon. Instead, the President took the offensive on the Open Skies policy, on disarmament policy, and threw down the gauntlet for peace. We have steadfastly, through 3-1/2 years, gone from trouble spot to trouble spot and today the world is at peace. Remember that. It's the last thing we should forget.

DR. WITMAN: Senator, I am convinced that this is not going to be a bipartisan foreign policy year. Let's go on to another issue. What do you think about some of the other questions that might be debated between the two political parties? You have talked about farm policy, for example. Do you think that's going to be an issue in 1956?

REP. HAYS: I think it's going to be an issue in the farm areas of the United States and I realize that the press has considerably minimized the importance of the farm vote by saying that there is no apparent revolt in the farm areas in the farm states. But you have to remember that in many states, for instance, my own State of

Ohio, it is very difficult for you, if you have been a Democrat, to switch into the Republican Party, or vice versa and you wouldn't expect much of a switch. But I think it might be significant to note that in the State of Ohio as a whole, the Republican primary vote this year dropped 30%, whereas the Democratic vote only dropped 8%. That would indicate to me that there was some dissatisfaction and certainly I think, being a farmer myself, that there is some reason to be dissatisfied.

DR. WITMAN: Senator Cotton, is this going to be an issue -- the farm policy question?

SEN. COTTON: Undoubtedly it will be talked about, but that doesn't necessarily make it an outstanding issue. In the matter of farm policy, I don't want to try to sound righteous, and I'm just as interested in votes as my good friend and opponent is, but it isn't a question of who gets the votes or which party is the friend of the farmer, it's a question of what policy is economically sound and the thing that will prevent the farm policy being a vital issue throughout this country is the fact that the farmers themselves, by and large, in my opinion the majority of them, know that it is uneconomic to keep up price supports and store surpluses and let them rot while people starve in various parts of the world. It is uneconomic, it has built this trouble, it is a thing that we want to stop. No party has ever suggested we keep it -- it's always one year more, one year more, which is usually election year -- and I don't believe the politician can make a campaign issue out of an uneconomic proposition with the intelligent farmers of this country voting next Fall. No, I don't think it's an outstanding issue. There are others that tower above it.

REP. HAYS: Could I say something to that? I think that it is an issue and I think you have very wisely, from your point of view, tried to steer around a direct issue. Nobody is in favor of piling up surpluses and letting them rot. But I think the farmer is going to think quite a long time about the fact that Secretary Benson, for instance, is using direct payments on two products which are the principal products in Utah, sugar and wool, and is paying the payments direct to the farmers, supporting them both at more than 100% of parity. Now, the farmer is going to get a little bit upset, I think, when it is pointed out to him that you can talk all you please about subsidy and the country can't afford to subsidize the farmers to the extent of \$5 billion worth of products, but the country has seen fit to support big business by subsidy since the end of this war, to the extent of \$50 billion. And I think the farmer is going to get a little bit excited about that and I'm going to be very frank with you -- I'm going to try to point it out to them and see if he won't. I think he should.

DR. WITMAN: I'd like to ask Senator Cotton what issues he thinks tower above the farm issue.

SEN. COTTON: I have already said that the paramount issue is peace, which will tower above all others. I think the next issue -- and here is the fundamental difference between the parties, the philosophic difference between the parties -- this Administration has been steadfastly committed to a program of keeping a government that is strong enough to keep us safe and secure, but is not so strong and concentrated that it steals away our liberties, our freedom and our opportunities. And so we have steadfastly cut the shackles that have been around the American people by so much government overlordship which has grown up through past years, and under the impetus, let me suggest to you, our internal economy has taken on a new health and a new power that it hasn't had for many long years. Now, peace in the world and a working economy at home and a chance for Americans to have good books on his parlor table and have better opportunities for his children are the outstanding questions in this campaign.

DR. WITMAN: Do you agree with that, Representative Hays?

REP. HAYS: Senator Cotton, I am sure you believe that but I want a chance to just make a bald statement and refute you. I just happened to carry along today's Sunday Boston paper and the big, inch-high headline says, "LeMay Pictures Red Air Blitz, Fears Soviet Could Crush US by 1959." Now that seems to refute your statement that we're so strong that we can fight off any attacks. General LeMay is the head of the Strategic Air Command and certainly he is no alarmist. And then you talk about

our great strong internal economic security and here is another small headline on today's paper that says, "Small Business Falls Behind Big Competitors in Profits." And you go on down and read in the third paragraph there, it says, "There is the highest failure rate for industry in 15 years -- bankruptcy rate."

DR. WITMAN: I am very fortunate that we're not going to have to solve each of these issues. All we are trying to do tonight is to find out what the issues are. We have a list of them and that list, at the moment, stands like this. These gentlemen think that the issues which they anticipate in the 1956 campaign are: The question of foreign policy; the question of farm policy; the whole matter of peace; government versus individual as a basic, philosophic approach stemming from each of the political parties; and the matter of the status of our internal economy. It is quite clear these gentlemen do not agree on the appropriate and correct interpretation of each of these issues, and since each represents a political party, I presume we can thereby conclude that the parties themselves are going to take different positions. But I want to push ahead to raise this question once more, at the risk of becoming very unpopular with these two gentlemen on my right and left, in which I say what other issues do you see? For example, is the issue of segregation going to really materialize in 1956, as between the two parties?

SEN. COTTON: May I have one-half minute to refer to an issue that my opponent just referred to and you passed over, unintentionally I am sure. I just want to suggest to you that when you pick up the papers and read the scareheads about whether or not we are properly advancing in national defense, remember we are spending \$100 million per day, and \$35 billion per year, and let anybody -- including my good friend from Ohio -- let anybody who starts frightening you with the same -- with the man that people said we shouldn't have for President because he was a military man is not up to defending this country -- let them tell you where they would change the emphasis. Would they stop guided missiles, would they take away the foot soldier, would they take away the emphasis on the Air Force? Where are they going to change the emphasis if they want a better defense? Let's not just say, "Pick flaws and be destructive." How do you get a better defense?

REP. HAYS: I'm glad that you brought that question up, Senator, because I'll tell you exactly what I object to. I object to the hucksters and the advertising agents telling the American people that everything is rosy when it isn't. Now, I was lead to believe, and certainly I have access to more information than the average person, that this ring of nuke bases that they're putting around Lake Erie and Northern Ohio is going to protect us from invasion. As a matter of fact, the paper said that you don't need to worry in Ohio when these bases are built -- that any jet bombers that come over, this nuke thing will go up and it has a device in it that will automatically lead it to the plane. It will hit the plane and destroy it. Well, somebody got a little suspicious and they had a test of these things out in New Mexico last week and they had a driver plane fly over it. It didn't go at 600 miles an hour, it wasn't a jet plane. It went at 160 miles an hour, a little bit faster than a Piper Cub, and they sent up six of these nukes on six different tries and the nuke got this little 160 miles an hour plane one time out of six, which means that the other five times it even missed a 160 mile an hour plane. Now, what I object to is to being kidded by the hucksters. If we haven't got defense, the American people can take it, they deserve to be told and we deserve to get on with the job. I'm not saying give up anything -- I'm saying let's get some research going and let's find some way to protect this country of ours and it doesn't make much difference to the average citizen what it's going to cost.

SEN. COTTON: Let me remind you, my good friend, of the famous words of Thomas Edison, who said to a friend that he had just found a thousand things that wouldn't work in manufacturing a new battery. And the friend said, "Why, you must be disturbed." He said, "Not at all, I've found a thousand things that won't work" -- now my good friend can pick up the papers, he can continue to say what he objects to, he can continue, undoubtedly, if he has inside information -- I doubt if he has it, I'm sure I don't and don't want it, the inside secrets of defense. You can pick flaws. Many a weapon

is not perfect but the fact remains, are we unflaggingly continuing our efforts in the right direction in guided missiles, in long-range striking power, in the fire power and the strength of our defense? And don't let anybody say we aren't unless they are going to tell you how they would improve that policy.

REP. HAYS: Senator, I think you have missed the whole point of my argument. I don't want to pick flaws. The thing I object to is to being told that something will work when it won't work. I object to the Defense Department and others trying to high-pressure us into thinking everything is rosy when it isn't. Certainly, I know that our scientists are laboring under difficulty and I know they are going to have to go down a thousand blind alleys before they find an open road, but I just don't want to be told that every time they go down a blind alley, that it's a four-lane highway. The thing I want is the truth, the plain, unvarnished truth and let's do away with this huckstering.

SEN. COTTON: If you want the truth, take it from the responsible members of the Defense Department and not from the scareheads in newspapers.

REP. HAYS: Who is more responsible than General LeMay? I'm only quotating what he testified before the Senate Committee, word-for-word from released testimony. I don't know where else you would get a more direct quote than that.

DR. WITMAN: I don't want to get us off national defense if this is the thing we ought to talk about, but are you satisfied now that you gentlemen have lifted the various issues which will come before the American people. I am coming back again to ask you about this question of segregation. Is segregation going to be a partisan issue, do you think?

SEN. COTTON: I would say No. As far as I am concerned, I'm just as willing to let the Democratic Party handle its own Eastlands. I just want to comment on the record of the Administration in the field of civil rights. Remember, it is this Administration that finally ended segregation in the Armed Forces. Remember, it is this Administration that has appointed more able Negroes to high positions in government than ever before. It is this Administration that sent its Attorney General to argue civil rights to the Supreme Court. It is this Administration that established a commission on government employment policies and it is this President that is asking the Congress to grant the Justice Department power to protect the rights of every citizen to vote in every state, and it is not the Republican Party that is in control of Congress, and it is not the Republican Party that is bottling up these questions in committees so they cannot be met face-on and full-head on the floor of the Congress.

REP. HAYS: I'll point out to the Senator that since I've been in Congress, the House of Representatives has passed civil rights legislation on at least three different times. He talks about the Democratic Party handling their Eastlands -- that's a problem -- but I would also say that he's a problem on the other side of the Capitol. There is at least one time that I can recall that the House passed civil rights legislation if enough Republicans had voted with the Liberal Democrats to choke off debate we could have gotten civil rights legislation through the Senate. We can get it through the House, we have done it before, we'll do it before this session is over, but, Senator, I'm going to reverse it and take it off the political basis and say once it gets over to your body, it's a problem in the Senate whether you get it out or not.

SEN. COTTON: Once it gets over to our body, I am very frank to confess it will be talked to death because we don't have room to shut people up the way you and I have been shut up properly by this good moderator.

DR. WITMAN: I wonder if that's a cue for me to come in? It might be. That, I am sure, is a very left-handed compliment, Senator. We've cataloged a number of the issues which we face in 1956. May I very quickly run over them. (1) Foreign policy, (2) farm policy, (3) the matter of the maintenance of peace, (4) the question of the role of government in relationship to the individual, (5) the status of our internal economy, (6) the measure of our national defense and (7) I think, but I'm not sure, segregation. Before we go to the floor for questions, I'm going to give each of you gentlemen one last chance to give us the other issues, if any, that you think were going to have to resolve between now and next November.

REP. HAYS: I think you have a pretty good list there and, as I said in my opening statement, there will probably be sectional issues that will come up all over the country but, nation-wide, I think if we can get a clear debate on the seven that you have listed we will probably have the people sufficiently informed or confused by that time so that they can make a decision at the polls.

SEN. COTTON: There are many collateral issues. I think some of these that you have named are not of paramount issue, but they're all important and I would simply wind up with the fact that the paramount issues are the question of whether or not we're getting effective leadership for peace abroad, and to make our economy work and increase opportunity at home.

DR. WITMAN: I'm quite impressed. This is the first time I've encountered two statesmen who have discussed this question without one reference to taxes. We'll go down to the floor now and have some questions. Perhaps somebody down there wants to ask you about the tax issue.

QUESTIONER: Senator Cotton, do you feel the Supreme Court decision on segregation in the public schools has been adequately implemented by the Republican Administration?

SEN. COTTON: I would say to that that the Supreme Court decision has been implemented as far as the Administration under the Constitution has the power to implement it. And I would add, and I say this as one who is willing to go the limit to see that we have equal opportunity for all people in this country -- I will add and in my honest opinion, persuasion rather than coercion at the start of this matter will bring about greater results for the minority groups. I want to see everything done to give to the Negro his full civil rights, his full economic rights and I want to see everything done in the way of education and persuasion and example to give him social life, but bear in mind that we can retard the advancement of the colored race and of other minority groups 100 years if we try to enforce it, as we tried to enforce Prohibition with a policeman and a club, and I say to you that the Republican Administration is gradually and seriously and constantly working toward a goal and, I hope, doing it in a sensible and a reasonable manner.

DR. WITMAN: Does that satisfy you, Sir?

QUESTIONER: Senator, do you agree with the Vice President that this is a Republican decision?

SEN. COTTON: No, Sir. And I want to make it plain right now. I don't know what the context of what the Vice President had to say is, and I don't know just what statement you have in mind. I'm going to speak for myself, not the Vice President. I want to say what I intended to say earlier in this debate, that great and patriotic and able Democratic leaders have held up the hands of this Administration on our great moral issues all through this Administration, and I'm not attacking the Democratic Party nor its great leaders. The decision of the Supreme Court was neither Republican or Democrat. It's said there are more Democrats on the Supreme Court than Republicans. I still have faith, although I don't always agree with everything the Supreme Court does, that when men go on the Supreme Court they cease to be Democrats and cease to be Republicans and I'd be the last to claim it as a Republican achievement. It doesn't belong to any group in this country, it belongs to America.

REP. HAYS: I would like to comment on that. In a debate you're not supposed to agree with your opponent but I want to say on what has just transpired that I agree in great measure with Senator Cotton. We have a little homely proverb out in Ohio that says you can catch more flies with sugar than you can with vinegar. And I certainly agree that in the beginning, at least, of the implementation of the Supreme Court decision that we ought to try all the forces of moral persuasion that we can before we consider moving in with troops and trying to enforce it as some hotheads would have us do, with the militia or with a battalion or a brigade or a division of troops. I think that what is the most important thing on this problem is that we set a basis whereby the people of this country can work together side by side with an amount of good will, without any discrimination. You can't always achieve that by force. A lot of times you can achieve it more easily by persuasion.

QUESTIONER: Representative Hays, is either party planning to heed the desires of the American people for federal school construction aid and make it one of the campaign issues?

REP. HAYS: I'll say to you that I, as an individual, am in favor of federal school construction aid and I think I'm safe in saying that the majority of the Democrats in Congress are. It's one of those issues, unfortunately, that cuts across party lines. You have people in both parties who are for it and you have people in both parties who are against it. In specific answer to your question, I think we're going to make it an issue and I think had the Administration given the kind of leadership that it could have given, we've have gotten something on that. But what have they done? They appointed a commission three years ago to study the problem and when that commission reported it said we need federal aid. And so then they appointed a committee to study the commission report and it reported about a year later and it said we need federal aid. And then they appointed a commission to study the two committee reports and it reported about three weeks ago and said we need federal aid, but the President hadn't pushed it. Now I suspect they'll come up, like they're talking about in foreign aid, with another commission and I'm a little bit tired of commissions because I have a definition of commissions that I think is a true one, and it goes something like this: A commission is a group of the uninformed, appointed by the unwilling to do the unnecessary.

SEN. COTTON: Let me say something about this matter of whether the Administration has worked for federal aid to education. The President of the United States has formally and definitely and repeatedly asked Congress for legislation and legislation has been introduced and brought into the Administration's policy to grant aid to school construction, keeping it confined to bricks and mortar and giving it to the backward communities that need it. Now, when you talk about the Republicans giving the leadership, let me remind my friend of something he knows so well, but inadvertently didn't remind you, that every committee in the Congress, Senate and House, is chairmaned by a Democrat and he has the power to bottle up legislation, and don't forget that it is Congressman Barden who has bottled up school construction, Congressman Walter who has bottled up immigration reform, and Senator Eastland that has bottled up civil rights.

REP. HAYS: I'd just like to point out, Senator, that when the President saw the farm issue getting pretty hot and the Democrats passed a farm bill he didn't like and he vetoed it and he was faced with the prospect of not having any, that he knew where to turn on the heat and exert some leadership to get the soil bank program through. Incidentally, it's a program which I think I was the first one in the Congress to mention and, incidentally, a program which Secretary Benson wrote to me as late as last September was unworkable and unthinkable and couldn't be put into practice.

SEN. COTTON: Let me remind you that when the Democrats, with that generosity of theirs to help out the President gave him the soil bank, that they piled into that bill 19 uneconomic measures, two of which will cost the farmers of this State of New England their very shirts.

DR. WITMAN: We've moved all the way from school construction to the soil bank and the shirts of the farmers. Let's see what this gentleman wants to ask us about?

QUESTIONER: Senator Cotton, what do you feel should be the proper attitude of our government towards the protection and preservation of the democracy of Israel?

SEN. COTTON: In the first place, remember this: Many of them are Americans who have close ties with Israel that want this country immediately to start sending arms to Israel. Remember what will happen if we do. We start sending arms to Israel. That's an invitation for the Soviet Union to furnish arms to the Arabs. There are two million inhabitants of Israel. There are forty million inhabitants of their opponent. And if you get into the situation that the world was in, in the Spanish Civil War, when the Axis powers were sending ammunition to Franco Spain and the Soviet powers were sending ammunition to Liberal Spain, you will start a conflict that will crush this world, and the first one to be crushed will be little Israel with its two million.

DR. WITMAN: Will this question be an issue in the campaign?

REP. HAYS: I don't know whether it is or now. I think that we're making a terrible mistake in the Near East, I was out there last Fall, in catering the way we are to the Arabs. I don't have anything to gain politically because I can tell you folks up here that if all the Jewish people in my district had a convention, they could almost hold it in a telephone booth. But I do say to you that out there in Israel is the only place in the Near East that any social progress is being made and when we're sending money to the leaders of the Arab States, such as Saudi Arabia, they're buying air-conditioned Cadillacs and building air-conditioned harems with it, and none of it is going to the people. Why do they hate Israel so? Because Israel is the living example of what you can do for all the people and the Arab leaders don't want their people to know what is going on in Israel because if they do they're going to have a new government in some of those Arab States. I don't think we ought to prop them up.

SEN. COTTON: We shall not desert Israel, but we are not going to invite her destruction.

QUESTIONER: Representative Hays, if the national defense is a real problem, as the Democratic party is making it, wishes us to believe, how, under Republican leadership in the White House have we experienced an unparalleled period of peace and prosperity, not experienced under 20 years of Democratic rule?

REP. HAYS: In the first place, I think your question sets up a premise which I don't quite agree with it because the prosperity is a continuation of prosperity which occurred before this Administration came in. In the second place, a good deal of the prosperity actually, of course, as we all know, is based on arms production. I don't exactly quite see the relation between the lack of an adequate national defense and peace and prosperity. We had prosperity of a sort in this country, you might say, the day that Pearl Harbor was attacked but the very fact that we had prosperity didn't stop a sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. And the fact that we have prosperity today or we have it next week or next year will not necessarily stop a fleet of Russian bombers if they should happen to be told to do it by the leaders in the Kremlin, from coming over here and dropping hydrogen bombs on us. I don't quite see the relationship between the two. I just think there are two separate questions there and I don't know how to answer them in one related group because I don't think they are related.

QUESTIONER: Senator Cotton, do you think the Republicans are committed to the same easy money, inflation producing policy as the Democrats were in preceding administrations?

SEN. COTTON: The brief answer to that is that the moment we came in we stopped the depreciation of the dollar. We have held it stable for four years. That is not something we promised, it is something we have done and I think you can be confident we will continue to do it.

REP. HAYS: Just in passing let me say that that used to be quite a political issue, about the fifty-cent dollar, but, you know I think more people are interested in whether they have a dollar in their trousers than whether it's a fifty-cent or a fifty-nine cent dollar. I came of voting age in the Hoover Administration and my biggest complaint was that I didn't have a dollar, never mind what it was worth.

QUESTIONER: Representative Hays, you mentioned the invasion of Indo-China by the Chinese. Do you think that we should have gone to war with the Chinese over their invasion of Indo-China; and if you do not think so, what should we have done about it?

REP. HAYS: That's a two-part question and I'll tell you something that a lot of people may not have known. The White House called in the Democratic leaders of the House and Democratic leaders of the Foreign Affairs Committee and asked them if they would support an invasion of Indo-China to keep the Communists out, and the Democratic leaders told them they wouldn't because on the basis of the military information we have, we would have been drawn into a war in China which we couldn't win.

DR. WITTMAN: I wish that we could continue this discussion and get other questions from the audience but our time has run out. Thank you, Senator Cotton, and Representative Hays, for giving us a clear picture of the problems that lie ahead of us in the coming election.

Our thanks to the hosts of this TOWN MEETING, the Lebanon Chamber of Commerce, and especially to Frank Musgrove, the President; Don Taber, Everett Bacon and Walter Paine of the "Valley News." Thanks also to Howard Chase of Station WTSB.